



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/177,572 10/23/1998		0/23/1998	YOSHIHIRO TERASHIMA	35.C13035	3325
5514	7590	06/28/2005		EXAMINER	
FITZPATRI		NGUYEN, KEVIN M			
30 ROCKEFI NEW YORK			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				2674	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	_	09/177,572	TERASHIMA ET AL.				
Office Acti	on Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Kevin M. Nguyen	2674				
The MAILING D Period for Reply	ATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE MAILING DATE (  - Extensions of time may be avafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the lift the period for reply specifies for NO period for reply is specifies. Failure to reply within the set	OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  railable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 he mailing date of this communication.  d above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply field above, the maximum statutory period w or extended period for reply will, by statute, ice later than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH( 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to c	ommunication(s) filed on <u>08 Ma</u>	arch 2005.					
2a)⊠ This action is FII		action is non-final.					
3)☐ Since this applic	,						
Disposition of Claims							
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) i 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>17 and</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) i		vn from consideration.					
Application Papers			·				
10) The drawing(s) fi Applicant may not Replacement draw	request that any objection to the oring sheet(s) including the correcti	r.  ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objection.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. {	<u> 119</u>	•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) ■ All b) ■ Some * c) ■ None of:  1. ■ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. ■ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. ■ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
	atent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/177,572 Page 2

Art Unit: 2674

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is made in response to applicant's amendment filed on March 08, 2005. Claims 1-16 are cancelled, claim 17 is amended, and claims 17 and 18 are currently pending in the application. An action follows below:

#### **Drawings**

2. The drawing was received on 05/21/2004. This drawing is acknowledged and approved.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwata et al (US 5,900,857) in view of Iwasaki (US 4,745,485).
- 5. As to claim 17, Kuwata et al teach a memory controller comprising a writing FIFO 2 (a first FIFO section, fig. 1) storing the image data of "a" x "2n"-bit width, where "a" is a size of the inputted bit width, "n" is a positive integer number, and 2 x "n" makes an even bit (see col. 13, lines 61-67, a capacity required for DRAM 3 is 3x5x138,240=2,073,600 bits);
- a DRAM 3 (a frame memory section, fig 1), a reading FIFO 5 (a second FIFO section, fig. 1);

Art Unit: 2674

Kuwata et al further teach, referring to col. 48, lines 44-48, input picture image data R, G, B of one frame in which pixel is constituted by 6 bits are inputted to a frame modulation/dither circuit (1). The frame modulation/dither circuit (1) produces R, G, B display data R1, G1, B1, each having 1 bit and the other data R2, G2, B2 each having 1 bit based on an input image data of 6 bits, and stores the data temporarily in FIFO2. Accordingly, a bit width of the image data stored in FIFO2 of Kuwata et al is 3/6 (1/2) of the bit width of the input image data, and would be "a" / "2n". Thus, Kuwata meets the limitation of the image data is read out from ... written into said frame memory section, and read out from said frame memory section, at a rate that is half "3/6 (1/2)" of a rate at which the image data.

the writing FIFO 2 (the first FIFO section, fig. 1) is of a size suitable for storing image data so that, within a period for inputting the image data in the writing FIFO 2 (the first FIFO section, fig. 1) to FULL capacity (col. 13, lines 61-67, a capacity required for DRAM 3 is 3x5x138,240=2,073,600 bits). A memory control section 9 (fig. 1) and a memory control section 4 (fig. 1) perform the function of writing the image data into the frame memory, reading out the image data from the frame memory and executing a command of frame memory section are conducted (see detail in col. 11, lines 59 through col. 12, lines 27).

Accordingly, Kuwata et al teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 17, except for "... a serial/parallel conversion... wherein the image data is read out from... written into said frame memory section, and read out from said frame memory section, at a rate that is half of a rate at which the image data..."

However, Iwasaki teaches a related memory controller which includes a serial/parallel conversion 2 (see figure 1).

Further, Iwasaki teaches "more specifically, the writing time and the reading time for one frame are equal and in the reading operation, for the upper display are 11, the video signal of the frame being presently written is read out and for the lower display area 12, the video signal one frame ahead thereof is read out. Since the picture signal is applied to the driver 9 at a speed equal to a half of the writing speed to the frame memories 4 and 5" (see col. 5, lines 55-63), as best understood.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the serial/parallel conversion (2) taught by Iwasaki for Kuwata's frame modulation dither circuit (1) and to modify Kuwata's frame memory (DRAM 3) including half speed of write into and read out from the frame memory, in view of the teaching in Iwasaki's reference because these would provide the picture that is represented stably even if it is a moving picture as taught by Iwasaki (col. 5, lines 65-66).

6. As to claim 18, Iwasaki teach a liquid crystal panel 10, a decoder 31, and the memory controller 18 (see figure 7).

## Response to Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments see pages 4 and 5, filed March 8, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 8. In response to applicant's argument states that claim 17 recites "the image data is read out from said first FIFO section, written into said frame memory section at half of

Art Unit: 2674

a rate at which the image data is inputted into said converter section, and read out from said frame memory section at a rate that is half of a rate at which the image data is inputted into said first FIFO section."

Examiner is not convinced by Applicant's argument. As stated *supra* with respect to claim 17, Examiner finds that the combination of Kuwata et al teach, referring to col. 48, lines 44-48, input picture image data R, G, B of one frame in which pixel is constituted by 6 bits are inputted to a frame modulation/dither circuit (1). The frame modulation/dither circuit (1) produces R, G, B display data R1, G1, B1, each having 1 bit and the other data R2, G2, B2 each having 1 bit based on an input image data of 6 bits, and stores the data temporarily in FIFO2. Accordingly, a bit width of the image data stored in FIFO2 of Kuwata et al is 3/6 (1/2) of the bit width of the input image data, and would be "a" / "2n", as modified by Iwasaki, teaches the claim 17 limitation of the frame memories can be formed with a total capacity corresponding to one frame (see col. 2, lines 8-9).

For these reasons, the rejections based on Kuwata et al and Iwasaki have been maintained.

### Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2674

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin M. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7697. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU from 8:00-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick N. Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the Patent Application Information Retrieval system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2674

Kevin M. Nguyen Patent Examiner Art Unit 2674

KMN June 14, 2005

> XIAO WU PRIMARY EXAMINER